

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-18, 29-32, and 39-48 are pending in the application.  
Claims 1, 3-18, 29-32, and 39-48 have been rejected.  
Claims 1-28 and 31-48 have been cancelled without prejudice.  
Claim 29 has been amended.  
New Claims 49-58 have been added.  
No new matter has been added.  
Reconsideration of the Claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the telephonic interview with the Examiner conducted on May 26, 2006, and in view of the interview, provides these arguments pointing to the distinguishing elements over the cited references.

#### **1. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,389,007 to Shenkman et al. (“Shenkman”).

For establishing anticipation, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. . . . The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” MPEP 2131 at p. 2100-73 (Rev. 3, August 2005) (citations omitted).

Claim 29 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 31.

Shenkman relates to an “integrated router” for a call center that includes a central switching apparatus 27, and an IPNT router 29. (See Shenkman Col. 6:1-7; Claim 3). A “COST-to-IPNT gateway 71 is provided and adapted to convert COST calls to IPNT calls.” (Shenkman Col. 7:25-26; see Figure 2). But Shenkman does not provide conversion of IPNT calls to COST calls. That is, Shenkman routes all calls from the PSTN domain to the IP domain, not between the PSTN and IP domains.

In contrast, Applicant’s Claim 29 as amended recites, *inter alia*, a “network spanning heterogeneous call center controller comprising: . . . a domain conversion module coupled to the switching element and the internet protocol interface, the domain conversion module to convert

between the internet protocol traffic and the circuit switched voice traffic, the domain conversion module responsive to the internet protocol interface.” (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element as set forth in Applicant’s claimed invention of Claim 29 and Claim 30 that depends therefrom, is not found in Shenkman. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection to Independent Claim 29 and dependent Claim 30 be withdrawn.

## **2. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant’s disclosure. MPEP § 2142, p. 2100-134 (Rev. 3, August 2005) (citations omitted).

(a) Claims 31, 32, and 38-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shenkman.

(b) Claims 1-18 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shenkman in view of US Patent No. 6,115,462 to Servi et al. (“Servi”).

Claims 1-18, 31, 32, and 38-48 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 31 has been incorporated into independent claim 29.

Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established in that Shenkman does not teach or suggest all the Claim limitations for Claim 31. Also, Applicant respectfully submits that Shenkman nor the hypothetical combination of Shenkman in view of Servi similarly do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of Applicant’s new claims 49-58.

### **3. Conclusion**

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 29, 30, and new Claims 49-58 in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an early allowance of such Claims. No fees are required for the claims in that the present number does not exceed those originally submitted.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *ksmith@texaspatents.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Garlick Harrison & Markison Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

**Date: July 24, 2006**

**/Kevin L. Smith/**  
Kevin L. Smith, Reg. No. 38,620  
Attorney for Applicant

**Garlick Harrison & Markison, LLP**  
P.O. Box 670007  
Dallas, Texas 75367  
(972) 772-8836/office  
(972) 772-5033/facsimile